

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's final Office Action of March 17, 2009 issued with respect to the present RCE application, the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment of claims and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to consistently recite "CPU write request", "non-CPU write request" and "non-CPU read request", to omit recitation of the "latency" of the requests and to specify that each timeslot is configured to enable performance of a CPU write request then either a non-CPU write request or non-CPU read request in that timeslot;
dependent claim 3 is amended to conform with amended claim 1;
independent claim 6 is amended similar to claim 1;
dependent claim 7 is amended to conform with amended claim 6; and
dependent claim 2, 5 and 9 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not add any new matter to the present application because support for these amendments can be found, for example, at paragraphs [2694]-[2698] of US Application Publication No. 2005/0177633 of the present application.

Regarding Claim Objections

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments of independent claims 1 and 6 to consistently recite "CPU write request", "non-CPU write request" and "non-CPU read request", provide the corrections required by the Examiner.

Regarding 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments of independent claims 1 and 6 to omit recitation of the "latency" of the requests brings the claim language into line with the described embodiments of the present specification.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claims 1 and 6, and claims 2-5, 7 and 9 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by Stacovsky, NPL2, Mundkur and Johnson either taken alone or in combination with one another, because none of these cited references teach or suggest configuring each timeslot to enable performance of a CPU write request then either a non-CPU write request or non-CPU read request in that timeslot, as is required by the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Richard Thomas Plunkett

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762